

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
FEBRUARY 17, 2009**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on February 17, 2009 at 6:50 p.m. by Chair Worthington in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Snyder, Spokely, Vitas, Young, Worthington

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Wilfred Wong, Community Development Director; Reg Murray, Senior Planner; Lance Lowe, Associate Planner; Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the January 6, 2009 meeting were approved as submitted.

ITEM III: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM IV: A. Design Review Permit Extension - 1255 Racquet Club Drive (Auburn Racquet Club) - File #DRP EXT 02-3(C).
The applicant requests approval of a 3-year time extension for the Auburn Racquet Club Expansion approved in 2002. *This item was continued from the Planning Commission hearing of February 3, 2009.*

Planner Murray presented the staff report. On February 3, 2009, this item was continued to provide the Public Works Department sufficient time to inspect the property and determine if any grading and/or drainage issues need to be addressed on the property. Public Works has visited the site and determined that new work will be necessary to address grading and drainage concerns. A memo from the Public Works Department identifying the work the property owner will need to complete in order to bring the site up to compliance with the City's storm water and grading ordinance is included in the staff report. The items identified in the memo will need to be addressed whether or not the Planning Commission grants the extension request. Based on the

aforementioned recommendations, staff believes the grading and draining issues will be addressed to the satisfaction of the Commission and that the extension request can be approved.

Bernie Schroeder of the Auburn Public Works Department stated that a site inspection was performed and a list of requirements was provided to the property owner. Staff visited the site today, and the water was fairly clear. Public Works believes that the developer has good intentions and will follow through with the requirements that have been imposed. The first requirement will be an action plan detailing a timeline to complete the work specified above. Public Works recommends extending the project and intends on working with the developer. Ms. Schroeder read the list of requirements to the Commission.

Comm. Spokely asked where the sediment basin is located.

Planner Murray used the overhead plan to locate the sediment basin.

Comm. Spokely asked what the time frame is to get the action plan completed.

Ms. Schroeder replied that they plan for approximately 10 days.

Comm. Snyder asked if there was any kind of review plan in place for the BMP's for projects that are extended such as this one was.

Ms. Schroeder responded that all grading permits are reviewed each year on October 15. At that time an inspection takes place, and the Public Works Department offers their assistance.

Chair Worthington requested that Item #5 on the Memorandum use the word "replace" instead of "reestablish". Ms. Schroeder agreed with this request.

The public hearing was opened.

Lee Buckingham, the architect for the property owner explained that there have been problems with drainage over the years. One of the major problems occurs when the pool filters are flushed. A swale was installed, however it apparently is not sufficient. He appreciates the efforts of the Public Works Department. The applicant will do whatever is necessary to correct the existing problems.

Mr. Keith Stoneking of 42 Lincoln Drive in Sausalito, California stated that he is the trustee for the property at 1025 Teal Court. He said that there have been past complaints to the project property owner and no action was taken. He is concerned about the permit extension

until the problems that have been outlined by the Public Works Department are completed.

Chair Worthington pointed out that whether or not the extension is granted, the Public Works requirements must be implemented.

Mayor Holmes entered the hearing to make a statement that the City Council meeting previously moved to closed session prior to the start of this hearing had adjourned and there was no reportable action.

The Commissioners discussed the possibilities for granting this extension with an effective date after Public Works has signed off on their requirements.

Ms. Schroeder stated that she wants the Commission to be aware that implementation of the action plan could take several months, depending on the weather.

Comm. Spokely asked if it is possible to grant the extension, and revoke it at a later date if the applicant has not satisfactorily completed the requirements of the Public Works Department.

Planner Murray replied that yes, it is possible.

Comm. Snyder suggested approval of the extension, with a deadline date of the hearing date closest to July 15, 2009 to complete the requirements.

Comm. Snyder **MOVED** to:

Continue this item to the Planning Commission meeting of July 21, 2009.

Comm. Vitas **SECONDED**.

AYES:	Snyder, Spokely, Vitas, Young, Chair Worthington
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None

The motion was approved.

B. Tentative Subdivision Map, Use and Tree Permits - 1320 Auburn Folsom Road (Whitehawk Court Subdivision) - File # SUB 08-1; UP 08-1 & TP 08-3. The applicant requests approval of a Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development & Tree Permit for the Whitehawk Court Subdivision. The Subdivision Map proposes

to subdivide the ±10.18 acre parcel into 18 single family lots ranging in size from ±6,534 (Lot 5) to ±45,302 square feet (Lot 11). The proposed Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development allows deviation in the site zoning standards contingent upon the provision of additional amenities beyond that afforded by the zoning (i.e. dedication of additional open space by clustering dwellings). A Tree Permit is required for the removal of ±41 native trees.

Comm. Vitas excused himself from this item due to a conflict of interest and left the meeting.

Planner Lowe presented the staff report. The proposed subdivision would consist of 18 single-family lots ranging in size from 65 square feet to over one acre. Home sizes are expected to be 2,000 to 3,000 square feet. Planner Lowe provided further details about the proposal, including access, utilities, grading and retaining walls, fencing, lighting, landscaping and signage, open space and drainage. He also described the requirements of the Tree Permit. There are two single family dwellings on the property which will be demolished prior to site construction.

The proposed Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development allows deviation from certain standards provided that additional amenities within the development be provided. In this case there are three deviations from the zoning standards. One is that some of the lots are less than the 20,000 square foot minimum required. Secondly, the applicant is proposing 15 foot front yard setbacks, with garages at a minimum of 20 feet. Thirdly, the applicant is proposing 15 foot rear yard setbacks which adjoin an approximate two acre open space parcel.

As a trade off for the mitigations, the applicant is proposing additional open space areas. Staff is conditioning the project to have an open space at the western end of the subdivision. Staff recommends approval of this project, subject to the conditions of approval noted in the staff report. The applicant has requested a three year approval period instead of the normal two years.

Chair Worthington asked if staff spoke with the applicant regarding access to Lot 9 with regard to the easement.

Planner Lowe explained that the access easement will stay with the property and staff does not anticipate any issues.

Chair Worthington asked about the discussions that have taken place with the applicant regarding access into the subdivision.

Planner Lowe replied that there have been several discussions with the applicant and the current plan is the third iteration of the design.

Chair Worthington asked how many of the lots are smaller than 20,000 square feet.

Planner Lowe responded that Lots 1 through 8 and 15 through 18 are less than 20,000 square foot in size.

Chair Worthington asked if the Fire Department created an urban interface fire protection plan.

Planner Lowe replied that one has not been prepared, but is required prior to final map.

Ms. Schroeder requested an additional condition requiring frontage improvements to include curb, gutter and sidewalks on the north side of Auburn Folsom Road.

Planner Lowe indicated that he will include this condition in the Conditions of Approval.

Comm. Young asked for confirmation that if the applicant was not given the ability to develop the smaller lots, the open space would be lost.

Planner Lowe confirmed this and pointed out that the density is under what could be constructed on this property.

Comm. Spokely asked how this subdivision fits into the surrounding area since it will have much smaller lots than other new subdivisions in the area.

Planner Lowe replied that the surrounding properties are zoned R1-20 and Agricultural/Residential, so the proposed lots are smaller than some of the adjoining properties.

Comm. Spokely asked if any consideration was given to retaining wall limitations for the new proposed lots on the south side of the subdivision.

Planner Lowe replied that there was not.

Comm. Spokely stated that it appears that homeowners could build retaining walls to obtain flat, usable yards. He is concerned about a tier of mismatched retaining walls along Auburn Folsom Road. He asked for a description of the proposed sewer system.

The applicant, Ed Giuliani of Giuliani & Kull at 500 Wall Street in Auburn explained that the plan is to have ejector systems on each of the homes. There would not be a city maintained sewer lift station at the subdivision.

Ms. Schroeder further explained that it would be routed to the lower Vintage Oaks lift station which is currently being upgraded. Each homebuilder will pay an individual sewer connection fee, as well as a surcharge for the number of City-owned lift stations that they will be utilizing.

Comm. Spokely stated that his biggest concern with this project is sight distance because there are some large oak trees obstructing visibility.

Mr. Giuliani replied that there are a couple of trees next to Auburn Folsom Road that are being removed. Although there is a slight curve in the road, visibility on Auburn Folsom Road is good in both directions.

Comm. Spokely and Mr. Giuliani discussed why Tribute Court was ruled out to be used as access to the subdivision.

Comm. Snyder asked if it is possible to tie Tribute Court into the new street by eliminating one lot.

Mr. Giuliani replied that he's unsure how the homeowners on Tribute Court would react to this suggestion because their cul-de-sac is privately owned.

Chair Worthington suggested an additional condition that the backs of the retaining walls that will face Auburn Folsom Road will match in material types and size.

Mr. Giuliani added that the building concept for the lower lots which are downhill is that the entrance is at the street grade with the second floor on the lower level. Therefore, there would be no need for retaining walls and it would eliminate having large structures that are visible from the road.

Chair Worthington responded that this however is a concept only, and a homeowner could choose to do something else.

Comm. Spokely asked if the 2 to 1 slope as shown on the plan is realistic.

Mr. Giuliani replied that the 2 to 1 slope is very close to the existing slope so grading is minimal on the uphill side. Most of the grading

shown on the plan is needed for the placement of the roadway. A specific soils report will be required with the final design.

There was discussion about the amount of grading required for this project.

Comm. Spokely asked if the homes on the back upper lots could potentially be very tall homes.

Planner Lowe replied that they could be taller, upwards of 40 feet. However, they would be approximately 60 feet lower than the Diamond Ridge subdivision located behind this project.

The Commissioners discussed their concerns about the potential for extreme building heights at this site.

The public hearing was opened.

Ed Giuliani requested clarification of some of the conditions of approval, which staff provided. He said that the meandering sidewalk was intended to feature the tree at that location.

Jerry Larson of 12070 Mont Vista Drive in Auburn who is the President of the Homeowner's Association for the subdivision above and behind this project asked if the water pressure in his subdivision will be affected by this subdivision.

Ms. Schroeder responded that the water pressure should not be affected at all.

Dennis Szuszka of 1430 Ridgeview Circle lives across from the proposed entryway to this subdivision. He is concerned about the proposed subdivision containing a cluster of small homes which would be inconsistent with the other homes in the area.

Chair Worthington asked Mr. Szuszka if access to his property is from Auburn Folsom Road.

Mr. Szuszka replied that it is not. The rear of his property faces the proposed subdivision.

There were no other comments from the audience. The public hearing was closed.

Comm. Spokely re-iterated his concern about the limited line of sight. He believes a reasonable argument has been made to justify the smaller lots, however he is opposed to the entrance location.

Ms. Schroeder advised that the improvement plans will not be approved until site distance is adequately addressed per the highway design manual.

The Commissioners discussed a continuation of this item.

Chair Worthington **MOVED** to:

Continue this item to the Planning Commission meeting of March 3, 2009 to allow the applicant and staff to address the following issues:

- Line of sight concerns at Auburn Folsom Road & Whitehawk Court
- Potential height of houses
- Potential height of retaining walls on Lots 1 - 7
- Elimination of Lot 1 at Lots 1 - 7
- What the City can do to compel the applicant to provide access from Tribute Court

Comm. Spokely **SECONDED**.

AYES: Snyder, Spokely, Young, Worthington
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: Vitas
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Commissioner Vitas returned to the dais.

ITEM V:

COMMISSION BUSINESS

A. Discussion of Planning Commission priorities list

Planner Murray presented the staff report. Five priority items were identified in 2008 including the sign ordinance, the parking standards, updating the zoning ordinance, pavement management issues and a trails master plan. Attached to the staff report is a Project Priority listing for 2/17/09. Additionally, there was a question at the last Planning Commission meeting about whether the Planning Commission and City Council had an arrangement to have an annual get-together. Staff provided the minutes from the City Council meeting and based upon that determined it was a one-time meeting, rather than an annual get together. If the Commission is interested in holding another joint meeting, the Commission could forward a request to the City Council (in conjunction with the annual review of priorities).

Chair Worthington requested that an invitation be extended by City Council annually for a joint meeting at the beginning of every year.

Comm. Snyder said he would support this if there is a list of things to be accomplished at the meetings.

Chair Worthington responded that her desired list would include being aware of the current financial state of the City, City Council's strategic vision (including a list of Capital Improvement projects), any current projects that are being implemented and the status of such projects. The get together would also allow the Commission to share their priority list with the City Council.

Comm. Young suggested a joint meeting with the Mayor and all of the other Committees and Commissions. The Commissioners discussed this idea.

Comm. Snyder stated that there is currently a "Mayor's Power Breakfast" where speakers inform the audience about what is happening in the city. He suggested that one of these breakfasts be tailored around these issues in a meeting with the other committees. He volunteered to ask Mayor Holmes about this.

The Commissioners identified their priorities as listed below:

- 1) Updating the Sign Ordinance
- 2) Review the parking standards
- 3) Update the Zoning Ordinance
- 4) Develop a Trails Master Plan and request that City Council establish an *ad hoc* committee to begin work on a Trails Master Plan.

B. Housing Element Implementation

Planner Murray presented the staff report. He reviewed the accomplishments that have occurred over the past year. No action is required at this time.

C. Updated General Plan implementation work plan and checklist

Planner Murray presented the staff report. He reviewed the items from the work plan that have been addressed or are currently being worked on.

**D. Auburn Land Use Plans and Implementation with SACOG
Blueprint comparison**

Planner Murray presented the staff report. He reviewed the Blueprint's seven basic principles. He stated that due to the economic climate in 2008, the City only processed a couple projects that meet, or will meet, some of the intent behind the *Blueprint*.

ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS

- A. City Council Meetings
No report.
- B. Future Planning Commission Meetings
No report.
- C. Reports
None.

ITEM VI: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ITEM X: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant